

# NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XIX, Issue No. 9

March 2014

*All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.*

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

## **Time to Disarm the Federal Government**

By Fitzwaryn

The military clearly needs firearms to carry out its mission of defending the United States from enemies outside our borders.

There is no need however for the Federal government, other than the military, to possess assault weapons, handguns or any other instrument capable of inflicting lethal force. The U.S. Constitution, the ultimate Law of the United States, specifically enshrines the Right of the PEOPLE to keep and bear arms. It does not provide or grant such a Right to the Federal Government.

Under U.S. law only the People of the United States have such a Right.

The Federal government has NO Police Power other than that regarding Federal Property and the Military.

**THERE IS NO GENERAL POLICE POWER GRANTED TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE CONSTITUTION.**

**THERE IS NO RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS GRANTED TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE CONSTITUTION.**

ALL Federal Police Power, which the Federal government has assumed on its own, has been justified as an extension of the Interstate Commerce clause which has been bastardized and stretched so far out of shape as to defy any defense.

Given that the Federal government has NO Police Powers, other than the exceptions noted above, and NO Right to keep and bear arms, with the exception of the Military, there is NO legal basis for anyone in the Federal government (other than the

military) to possess, to keep, to carry or to bear arms. Non-military Federal personnel who carry guns, other than in their role as private Citizens, are in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

It's time to start regulating, registering and severely restricting gun possession by the Federal government with the ultimate goal of eliminating all non-military gun possession by the Federal government. The Federal government is granted ONLY the specific powers enumerated in the Constitution with all other power belonging to the States or the people. Since the Federal government is not specifically granted the right to hunt in the Constitution there should be no exceptions for sporting guns. Individual government employees can, of course, keep and bear arms on the basis of being a member of the People of the United States.

The Federal government has no Right to Self Defense as a government since both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution enshrine the Right of the People to replace any government which does not serve them as they demand.

Given that the Federal government has no Police Power, no Right to keep and bear arms, no right to hunt and no legitimate Right to self-defense (since Self Defense is an Individual Right) there is no justification for the non-military portions of the Federal government to be armed.

The only possible use of guns by the Federal government is for the use of deadly force against the people of the United States.

Such actions in violation of the U.S. Constitution and the growing number of atrocities and crimes carried out by the Federal government is

endless. Waco. Ruby Ridge. Elian Gonzales. SWAT Team raids on farms, private citizens, guitar manufacturers makes it evident that the federal government is not responsible enough to possess firearms.

Congress needs to act.

The People of the United States need to act.

Contact your Congressman and Senator. Demand that the Federal government be disarmed before more people die and more crimes are committed that turn the United States into a pariah before other nations. Correct the problem before the American People are required to act.

Support candidates who believe in disarming the Federal government. Contribute money to candidates and organizations which support disarming the Federal government. Vote for candidates who support disarming the Federal government.

Let's put an end to the clear and present danger of rogue government employees and out of control agencies having the capability of inflicting deadly force on the American people.

Let's return the Federal government to its proper role as the Servant of the people and not it's Master.

-- <http://beforeitsnews.com> Feb. 19, 2013

## **When Martin Luther King Gave Up His Guns**

By Mark Engler and Paul Engler

Few are aware that Martin Luther King, Jr. once applied for a permit to carry a concealed handgun.

In his 2011 book *Gunfight*, UCLA law professor Adam Winkler notes that, after King's house was

bombed in 1956, the clergyman applied in Alabama for a concealed carry permit. Local police, loathe to grant such permits to African-Americans, deemed him "unsuitable" and denied his application.

The fact that King would request license to wear a gun in 1956, just as he was being catapulted onto the national stage, illustrates the profundity of the transformation that he underwent over the course of his public career.

While this transformation involved a conversion to moral nonviolence and personal pacifism, that is not the whole story. King's evolution also involved a hesitant but ultimately forceful embrace of direct action — broad-scale, confrontational and unarmed. That stance had lasting consequences in the struggle for freedom in America.

The 1956 Montgomery Bus Boycott, in the wake of Rosa Park's arrest in late 1955, thrust King into the leadership of the movement. Soon he was receiving phone calls on which unidentified voices warned, "Listen, nigger, we've taken all we want from you. Before next week you'll be sorry you ever came to Montgomery." After such threats resulted in the bombing of King's home in February 1956, armed watchmen guarded against further assassination attempts.

In his talks before mass meetings, King preached the Christian injunction to "love thy enemy." Having read Thoreau in college, he described the bus boycott as an "act of massive noncooperation" and regularly called for "passive resistance." Out-of-state visitors who were knowledgeable about the principles of unarmed direct action — such as Rev. Glenn Smiley of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and Bayard Rustin of the War Resisters League — took notice of the firearms around the King household and argued for their removal. In a famous incident described by historian David Garrow, Rustin was visiting King's parsonage with reporter Bill Worthy when the journalist almost sat on a pistol. He and King stayed up late that night arguing about whether armed self-defense in the home could end up damaging the movement. It was not long before King had come around to the position advocated by groups like the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

In 1959, at the invitation of the Gandhi National Memorial Fund, King made a pilgrimage to India to study the principles of *satyagraha*, and he was moved by the experience. Ultimately, he never embraced the complete pacifism. Later, in the Black Power years, King made a distinction between people

using guns to defend themselves in the home and the question of "whether it was tactically wise to use a gun while participating in an organized protest." But, for himself, King claimed nonviolence as a "way of life," and he maintained his resolve under conditions that would make others falter.

-- wagingnonviolence.org Jan. 15, 2014

### **Is the ATF using tactics akin to "Fast and Furious" at home to undermine gun rights?**

By Sam Rolley

House

Oversight

Committee chairman Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) said that a recent news report outlines how the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) is using tactics that amount to "Fast and Furious revisited" in a bid to increase support for the Obama Administration's gun control crusade. ["Fast and Furious" was an ATF operation that "walked" hundreds of illegal guns into Mexico, one of which was traced to the murder of a U.S. Border Patrolman.]

Issa discussed a Dec. 7 report by the *Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel* which details how ATF agents operating stings in six different cities "took advantage of the mentally ill, set up stings near churches and schools and made decisions which some claim actually increased crime in their neighborhoods."

"This is Fast and Furious revisited," Issa said. "You finally have a confirmed director, Todd Jones, who was supposed to clean up these operations. And instead they're continuing to have this what's called a 'rogue organization.' But I want to make sure I make one thing clear. The ATF never acts alone. The FBI and the U.S. attorneys in each of these areas — political appointees — they work hand in hand.... President Obama's Department of Justice continues to support these sting operations that lead to harm in communities."

The *Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel* reported the following tactics used by the ATF:

■ ATF agents befriended mentally disabled people to drum up business and later arrested them in at least four cities. In Wichita, Kan., ATF agents referred to a man with a low IQ as "slow-headed" before deciding to secretly use him as a key cog in their sting. And agents in Albuquerque, N.M., gave a brain-damaged drug addict with little knowledge of weapons a "tutorial" on machine guns, hoping he could find them one.

■ Agents in several cities opened undercover gun- and drug-buying operations near churches and schools, allowed teens to smoke marijuana, and provided alcohol to underage youths. In Portland, attorneys for three teens who were charged said a female agent dressed provocatively, flirted with the boys and encouraged them to bring drugs and weapons to the store to sell.

■ Agents offered sky-high prices for guns, leading suspects to buy firearms at stores and turn around and sell them to undercover agents for a quick profit. In other stings, agents ran fake pawnshops and readily bought stolen items, such as electronics and bikes — no questions asked — spurring burglaries and theft. In Atlanta, agents bought guns that had been stolen just hours earlier, several ripped off from police cars.

■ In Pensacola, the ATF's pawnshop partner was later convicted of pointing a loaded gun at someone. Instead of a stiff sentence typically handed down to repeat offenders in federal court, he got six months in jail — and a pat on the back from the prosecutor....

-- Personal Liberty Digest January 13, 2014

### **Read the bill? Oh, Never Mind**

It was a rallying cry of the tea party in 2010 and of Republicans bitter about a 906-page health-care law that few proponents had read. Republicans made a "read the bill" pledge and vowed that they would put the text of bills online at least 72 hours before votes.

A very different Republican Party rushed a vote on Wednesday, just 44 hours after it was posted. The bill was 1,582 pages and accompanying explanatory statements added 1,278 more, which means lawmakers had less than a minute to read each page, even if they didn't sleep.

-- Washington Post 18 Jan 14

### **Guns, Drones and the President**

***In Obama's world, secret killing is OK but self-defense is not***

By Judge Andrew Napolitano

How can the president claim the lawful power to kill whomever he wishes and at the same time ask Congress to incapacitate our ability to defend ourselves against those who might seek to kill us?

Sen. Rand Paul of Kentucky struck a raw nerve in the weak underbelly of the Obama administration with his 13-hour filibuster last month. Mr. Paul was furious — as every other American should be — that the

president refused to acknowledge that he does not possess the lawful authority to kill Americans with drones. The senator articulated the principled constitutional argument that whenever the government wants the life, liberty or property of an American, it can obtain that only via due process.

Due process is the command of the Fifth Amendment for a fair jury trial and the accompanying constitutional protections, so that our natural rights — here, the rights to life, liberty and property and to fairness from the government — not suffer under another Star Chamber. The Star Chamber was a secret gaggle of advisers to British kings that decided who among the king's adversaries would lose his life, liberty or property without due process. Once that decision was made, it was carried out.

Mr. Paul articulated all of this during his filibuster. He made principled moral and legal arguments for 13 hours. His arguments read like a passionate college lecture on personal liberty in a free society.

The next day, Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr. sent a terse letter to Mr. Paul that reads in its entirety as follows: *"It has come to my attention that you have now asked an additional question: 'Does the President have the authority to use a weaponized drone to kill an American not engaged in combat on American soil?' The answer to that question is no."* This is an unremarkable statement, but one that came about only after the senatorial equivalent of pulling teeth.

Mr. Paul's filibuster was prompted by the administration's repeated refusal to answer that question. Those refusals came from the testimony of Mr. Holder, FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III and Mr. Brennan while he was the CIA director nominee. They all declined to answer the question of whether the president has the power to use drones to kill Americans in America, and they all referred the questioners to their boss in the White House.

Their boss has never publicly answered that question, but he has exercised that horrific power without publicly defending or legally justifying it. When attorneys for potential victims of presidential killings (how terrifying does that sound?) sought to ascertain the source of that power, the president dispatched Justice Department attorneys to persuade judges that the legal argument supporting killings is classified. That's because, those Justice Department attorneys argued, the decisions to kill — just like the Star

Chamber's decisions to kill — are made in secret; hence, the legal support for the killings must be kept secret.

The same president who insists he can't reveal the legal basis for his killing wants to take away your right to self-defense against a killer, and he wants to prevent you from having the means with which to shoot at a tyrant should such a monster take over the government.

The reason we are a free and independent people today is because we had the means with which to repel the soldiers of the British king. Without weaponry in the hands of ordinary folks and unknown to the government (so it doesn't know from whom to seize weapons), we will lack the ability to repel a modern-day George III.

Today, we have a president who has sworn to uphold the Constitution but seems hellbent on violating it. He wants to use the force of legislation to weaken your right to self-defense, and he is using powers never granted to him to kill uncharged, unindicted Americans who his advisers in secret have decided must go. The government derives its powers from the consent of the governed. Do you know anyone who consented to this? If you do, they consented for themselves. The rest of us will keep our lives, liberty and property and defy any government efforts to take them. —Washington Times April 11, 2013

## Thoughts on the Super Bowl and Sports In General

By Chuck Baldwin

I have always enjoyed sports, including spectator sports like the Super Bowl, but I believe that the obsession of so many men with sports (especially football) is an indication that our country is in a very serious decline. In fact, the obsession with sports today is comparable to the obsession that Romans had with the gladiator "games" in the waning years of that empire. They were so distracted with the "games" that they didn't notice that their country was collapsing. The same thing is happening in America now. The average American man today couldn't list the Bill of Rights to save his life, but he knows the minutest details of his favorite sports team. Listen to the foyer conversations at almost any church and all you will hear are men talking about sports. If the men of America were as passionate about preserving liberty as they are cheering for their favorite football team, our country would not be in the sinkhole it is in today.

Furthermore, as much as I love football, I am personally chagrined at how liberal and globalistic the corporate office of the NFL has become. The NFL wages war against people who try to hold up John 3:16 signs in the stadiums. Virtually any other sign or banner is completely welcome, but try to hold up a John 3:16 banner, and you will be escorted out. They allow Bob Costas to wax long and loud for additional gun control, but refuse to allow Daniels Defense to purchase a wholesome, family-friendly commercial—even though it contained no reference whatsoever to firearms. The NFL denies prohibiting the commercial and accuses FOX network of doing it. FOX says it was only abiding by NFL policy. During last year's Super Bowl, the NFL allowed Mayor Michael Bloomberg's "Mayors Against Illegal Guns," to air a pro-gun-control commercial. And, of course, it didn't offend NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell to air Coca Cola's globalist commercial in this year's Super Bowl that featured the song, "America, The Beautiful," being sung in foreign languages.

The Coke commercial offended the majority of the American people who saw it. Coca Cola has been inundated with loud and angry responses to the commercial—and rightfully so. America was founded and built by English-speaking people. We shouldn't have to "push one for English" or listen to "America, The Beautiful" being sung in foreign tongues. America is an English-speaking country. Get over it!

I continue to believe that organized sports can be a very healthy and helpful tool for young people. And I continue to enjoy what little sports I have time to watch these days. But too many of America's men are more concerned about who wins the Super Bowl than whether their children will grow up in a land of liberty. Yes, I was rooting for the Seahawks last Sunday evening, but on Monday morning I was talking about the deterioration of our liberties—not the deterioration of the Broncos gridiron performance. Come on, fellas. Don't let your love of sports distract you from your love of liberty. The collapse of Denver's offense last Sunday is nothing compared to the collapse of our country's freedoms tomorrow. —Chuck@chuckbaldwinlive.com February 6, 2014

## In Memoriam

Jack McLamb, former Phoenix peace officer and publisher of Aid and Abet Police and Military Newsletter, died

January 14 at age 69 in Evansville, Indiana. The reader who sent us the news of Jack's death added his own note: "Until he moved to Indiana a few months ago Jack had a daily 'radio' show on the I-net on Republic Broadcasting Network. During the Ruby Ridge 'standoff' with the surviving members of Randy Weaver's family, Jack was there with Bo Gritz to try to prevent more bloodshed (they did)."

## Britain Embraces Jihad Terror

By Robert Spencer

I received a letter from the British Home Office, notifying me that I would not be allowed to enter the country on the grounds that "your presence here is not conducive to the public good." My colleague Pamela Geller received a similar letter. We had planned to lay a wreath at a memorial to British soldier Lee Rigby, who was beheaded by Islamic jihadists on a Woolwich street on May 22. Apparently it is not conducive to the public good in Britain to oppose jihad violence and Islamic supremacism.

The Home Office's letter to me said, "You are reported to have stated the following: [Islam] is a religion and is a belief system that mandates warfare against unbelievers for the purpose for establishing a societal model that is absolutely incompatible with Western society because media and general government unwillingness to face the sources of Islamic terrorism these things remain largely unknown."

I said no such thing, of course. I generally speak and write in coherent English. But the point is clear enough. I certainly have pointed out that Islam mandates warfare against unbelievers. This is not really a controversial point to anyone who has studied Islam at all.

In any case it is good that Britons will not be subjected to hateful misrepresentations of Islam like this spectacularly noxious bit of Islamophobia:

"Devotion to jihad for the sake of Allah, and the desire to shed blood, to smash skulls, and to sever limbs for the sake of Allah and in defense of His religion is, undoubtedly, an honor for the believer. Allah said that if a man fights the infidels, the infidels will be unable to prepare to fight."

You may be wondering if it was I or Pamela Geller who penned that hate-filled misrepresentation of the beautiful Islamic doctrine of jihad. But in fact it was Mohammed al-Arefe, a Saudi Muslim cleric.

Apparently approving of such violence as an Islamic imperative is just

fine with the British Home Office. Mohammed al-Arefe was just last week admitted into Britain without any difficulty. If one disapproves of such violence as an Islamic imperative, however, watch out: that is not conducive to the public good.

Thus Britain has not actually banned the truth about Islam. You can get into Britain if you believe that Islam mandates warfare against unbelievers. You just have to think warfare against unbelievers is a fine thing to pursue.

And thus the foremost lesson arising from the banning of Pamela Geller and Robert Spencer is this: the unbelievers in Britain don't stand a chance.

-- www.frontpage.com, *News from the Front*, Vol. 15, Issue 2, August 2013

## How Covert Government Agents Infiltrate the Internet to Manipulate, Deceive and Destroy Reputations

By Glenn Greenwald

One of the many pressing stories that remains to be told from the Snowden archive is how western intelligence agencies are attempting to manipulate and control online discourse with extreme tactics of deception and reputation-destruction.

Over the last several weeks, I worked with *NBC News* to publish a series of articles about "dirty trick" tactics used by [Britain's surveillance agency] GCHQ's previously secret unit, JTRIG (Joint Threat Research Intelligence Group). These were based on four classified GCHQ documents presented to the NSA and the other three partners [Australia, Canada, New Zealand] in the English-speaking "Five Eyes" alliance. Today, we at *the Intercept* are publishing another new JTRIG document, in full, entitled "The Art of Deception: Training for Online Covert Operations."

Our NBC reporting highlighted the monitoring of YouTube and Blogger, the targeting of Anonymous with the very same DDoS attacks they accuse "hacktivists" of using, the use of "honey traps" (luring people into compromising situations using sex) and destructive viruses. But the overarching point revealed by all of these documents is that these agencies are attempting to control, infiltrate, manipulate, and warp online discourse, and in doing so, are compromising the integrity of the internet itself.

Among the core self-identified purposes of JTRIG are two tactics: **(1)** to inject all sorts of false material onto the internet in order to destroy the

reputation of its targets; and **(2)** to use social sciences and other techniques to manipulate online discourse and activism to generate outcomes it considers desirable. Just consider the tactics they boast of using to achieve those ends: "false flag operations" (posting material to the internet and falsely attributing it to someone else), fake victim blog posts (pretending to be a victim of the individual whose reputation they want to destroy), and posting "negative information" on various forums.

No matter your views on Anonymous, "hacktivists" or garden-variety criminals, it is not difficult to see how dangerous it is to have secret government agencies being able to target any individuals they want – **who have never been charged with, let alone convicted of, any crimes** – with these sorts of online, deception-based tactics of reputation destruction and disruption....

Government plans to monitor and influence internet communications, and covertly infiltrate online communities in order to sow dissension and disseminate false information, have long been the source of speculation. Harvard Law Professor Cass Sunstein, a close Obama adviser and the White House's former head of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, wrote a controversial paper in 2008 proposing that the US government employ teams of covert agents and pseudo-"independent" advocates to "cognitively infiltrate" online groups and websites, as well as other activist groups.

Sunstein also proposed sending covert agents into "chat rooms, online social networks, or even real-space groups" which spread what he views as false and damaging "conspiracy theories" about the government. Ironically, the very same Sunstein was recently named by Obama to serve as a member of the NSA review panel, one that – while disputing key NSA claims – proceeded to propose many cosmetic reforms to the agency's powers (most of which were ignored by the President who appointed them).

But these GCHQ documents are the first to prove that a major western government is using some of the most controversial techniques to disseminate deception online and harm the reputations of targets....

-- the Intercept, 24 February 2014

Commentary: So the next time you receive word from some "patriot" for actions that are too simple, obvious, direct, and appealing, the odds are high that is coming from a government agent.

## The Special Ops Surge: America's Secret War in 134 Countries

By Nick Turse

They operate in the green glow of night vision in Southwest Asia and stalk through the jungles of South America. They snatch men from their homes in the Maghreb and shoot it out with militants in the Horn of Africa. They feel the salty spray while skimming over the tops of waves from the Caribbean to the Pacific. They conduct missions in the oppressive heat of Middle Eastern deserts and the deep freeze of Scandinavia. The vast majority of these missions take place far from prying eyes, media scrutiny, or any type of outside oversight, increasing the chances of unforeseen blowback and catastrophic consequences.

Formally established in 1987, Special Operations Command is reportedly on track to reach 72,000 personnel in 2014, up from 33,000 in 2001. Funding for the command has jumped from \$2.3 billion in 2001 to \$6.9 billion in 2013 (\$10.4 billion, if you add in supplemental funding). Personnel deployments abroad have skyrocketed, too, from 4,900 "man-years" in 2001 to 11,500 in 2013.

Special operators -- Green Berets and Rangers, Navy SEALs and Delta Force commandos, specialized helicopter crews, boat teams, and civil affairs personnel -- were deployed to 134 countries during fiscal year 2013, according to SOCOM Maj. Matthew Robert Bockholt Public Affairs.

Last year, SOCOM chief Admiral William McRaven explained his vision for special ops globalization. In a statement to the House Armed Services Committee, he said: "USSOCOM is enhancing its global network of SOF to support our interagency and international partners in order to gain expanded situational awareness of emerging threats and opportunities. The network enables small, persistent presence in critical locations, and facilitates engagement where necessary or appropriate..."

Deployments in 134 countries, however, turn out not to be expansive enough for SOCOM. In November 2013, the command announced that it was seeking to identify industry partners who could, under SOCOM's Trans Regional Web Initiative, potentially "develop new websites tailored to foreign audiences." These would join an existing global network of 10 propaganda websites, run by various combatant commands and made to look

like legitimate news outlets, including CentralAsiaOnline.com, Sabahi which targets the Horn of Africa; an effort aimed at the Middle East known as Al-Shorfa.com; and another targeting Latin America called Infosurhoy.com.

SOCOM's push into cyberspace is mirrored by a concerted effort of the command to embed itself ever more deeply inside the Beltway. "I have folks in every agency here in Washington, D.C. -- from the CIA, to the FBI, to the National Security Agency, to the National Geospatial Agency, to the Defense Intelligence Agency," SOCOM chief Admiral McRaven said during a panel discussion at Washington's Wilson Center last year. Speaking at the Ronald Reagan Library in November, he put the number of departments and agencies where SOCOM is now entrenched at 38.

Although elected in 2008 by many who saw him as an antiwar candidate, President Obama has proved to be a decidedly hawkish commander-in-chief whose policies have already produced notable instances of what in CIA trade-speak has long been called blowback.

The White House has also overseen an exponential expansion of America's drone war. While President Bush launched 51 such strikes, President Obama has presided over 330, according to research by the London-based Bureau of Investigative Journalism.

In recent years, however, the unintended consequences of U.S. military operations have helped to sow outrage and discontent, setting whole regions aflame. More than 10 years after America's "mission accomplished" moment, seven years after its much vaunted surge, the Iraq that America helped make is in flames. A country with no al-Qaeda presence before the U.S. invasion now has two cities flying al-Qaeda flags.

A more recent U.S. military intervention to aid the ouster of Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi helped send neighboring Mali, a U.S.-supported bulwark against regional terrorism, into a downward spiral, saw a coup there carried out by a U.S.-trained officer, ultimately helped to unleash nothing short of a terror diaspora in the region.

As retired Army Colonel Andrew Bacevich, professor of history and international relations at Boston University, has noted, the utilization of Special Operations forces during the Obama years has decreased military accountability, strengthened the "imperial presidency," and set the stage for a war without end. "In short," he

wrote at TomDispatch, "handing war to the special operators severs an already too tenuous link between war and politics; it becomes war for its own sake."

In his blueprint for the future, SOCOM 2020, Admiral McRaven has touted the globalization of U.S. special ops as a means to "project power, promote stability, and prevent conflict." Last year, SOCOM may have done just the opposite in 134 places.

-- www.tomdispatch.com 16 Jan. 2014

## Can You Trust a Government?

Can you trust a government:

- \*that pays farmers not to grow crops
- \*that encourages and facilitates infanticide on a grand scale
- \*that indoctrinates students from kindergarten to university
- \*that funneled guns to Mexican drug cartels
- \*that maintains over 1,000 military bases in foreign countries, conducts covert military operations in many of them, and is always looking for "good little wars" around the globe.

## Life in the Electronic Concentration Camp

By John W. Whitehead

What is most striking about the American police state is not the mega-corporations running amok in the halls of Congress, the militarized police crashing through doors and shooting unarmed citizens, or the invasive surveillance regime which has come to dominate every aspect of our lives. No, what has been most disconcerting about the emergence of the American police state is the extent to which the citizenry appears content to passively wait for someone else to solve our nation's many problems. Unless Americans are prepared to engage in militant nonviolent resistance in the spirit of Martin Luther King Jr. and Gandhi, true reform, if any, will be a long time coming.

Yet as I detail in my book *A Government of Wolves: The Emerging American Police State*, if we don't act soon, all that is in need of fixing will soon be unfixable, especially as it relates to the police state that becomes more entrenched with each passing day. By "police state," I am referring to more than a society overrun by the long arm of the police. I am referring to a society in which all aspects of a person's life are policed by government agents, one in which all citizens are suspects, their activities monitored and regulated, their movements tracked, their communications spied upon, and their

lives, liberties and pursuit of happiness dependent on the government's say-so.

As the following will show, the electronic concentration camp, as I have dubbed the surveillance state, is perhaps the most insidious of the police state's many tentacles, impacting almost every aspect of our lives and making it that much easier for the government to encroach on our most vital freedoms, ranging from free speech, assembly and the press to due process, privacy, and property, by eavesdropping on our communications, tracking our consumer activities, our public activities, our phone activities, our computer activities, our social media activities, tracking us based on our face, our behavior, our car, our metadata; tracking us from the skies.

Thus, we have arrived in Orwell's world. The question now is: will we take a stand and fight to remain free or will we go gently into the concentration camp?

-- The Rutherford Institute, 06 Jan. 2014

### **Elites Call for "Extraordinary Crisis" to Preserve New World Order**

By Joseph Paul Watson

Writing for the Atlantic Council, a prominent think tank based in Washington DC, Harlan K. Ullman warns that an "extraordinary crisis" is needed to preserve the "new world order," which is under threat of being derailed by non-state actors like Edward Snowden.

The Atlantic Council is considered to be a highly influential organization with close ties to major policy makers across the world. It's headed up by Gen. Brent Scowcroft, former National Security Advisor under Presidents Gerald Ford and George H. W. Bush. Scowcroft has also advised President Barack Obama.

Harlan K. Ullman was the principal author of the "shock and awe" doctrine and is now Chairman of the Killowen Group which advises government leaders.

In an August 15, 2013 article entitled "War on Terror Is not the Only Threat", Ullman asserts that, "tectonic changes are reshaping the international

geostrategic system," arguing that it's not military superpowers like China but "non-state actors" like Edward Snowden, Bradley Manning and anonymous hackers who pose the biggest threat to the "365 year-old Westphalian system" because they are encouraging individuals to become self-empowered, eviscerating state control.

"Very few have taken note and fewer have acted on this realization," notes Ullman, lamenting that "information revolution and instantaneous global communications" are thwarting the "new world order" announced by U.S. President George H.W. Bush more than two decades ago.

"Without an extraordinary crisis, little is likely to be done to reverse or limit the damage imposed by failed or failing governance," writes Ullman, implying that only another 9/11-style cataclysm will enable the state to re-assert its dominance while "containing, reducing and eliminating the dangers posed by newly empowered non-state actors."

Ullman concludes that the elimination of non-state actors and empowered individuals "must be done" in order to preserve the new world order. A summary of their material suggests that the Atlantic Council's definition of a "new world order" is a global technocracy run by a fusion of big government and big business under which individuality is replaced by transhumanist singularity.

-- Infowars.com January 17, 2014

### **Spare us the gun lecture, Harvey**

Gun owners and the powerful lobby that represents them don't care what Hollywood thinks of them, a lesson producer Harvey Weinstein will learn soon.

Weinstein "reluctantly" told Howard Stern that he's planning a movie that will make the NRA "wish they weren't alive." In an exclusive interview with Piers Morgan, he says that none other than Meryl Streep will star as an anti-gun senator.

For so many reasons, Weinstein deserves a good, hard reality check.

For one, there's the obvious and almost comical hypocrisy. Weinstein's profited immensely from portraying graphic gun violence in films such as "Kill Bill" and "Pulp Fiction."

In the same Morgan interview, he says he'll stop making movies that glamorize guns. But according to Internet Movie Database, "Kill Bill Vol. 3" and "Sin City: A Dame to Kill For" are in the works.

For another, Weinstein's got the wrong target. The NRA represents law-abiding gun owners. A gangbanger in Chicago doesn't care about the NRA, isn't motivated or supported by the NRA, and may not even know what the NRA is. In vowing to take down this powerful organization supported by millions of law-abiding citizens, Weinstein will simply end up empowering and emboldening it.

And lastly, the effort most certainly won't rid the country of guns (a goal he's admitted to having, unless there's another Holocaust in which case he very much wants a gun, or something.)

Proving the nation's gun owners not only don't care about Hollywood's dictates but Washington's either, in the year since the tragic Newtown, Connecticut, gun sales are up 8%.

Weinstein is entitled to spend Hollywood money on a movie in which Meryl Streep is paid to rail against a constitutionally protected right and a robust and defensive American community. But I promise, every penny he makes will be multiplied manifold in NRA contributions. Good luck, Harvey.

-- S.E. Cupp, CNN "Crossfire" Host January 17, 2014

\* \* \*

The greatest danger to the liberal vision are facts about the consequences of liberalism itself and the laws, policies and ways of life that the left has spawned. The black family, which survived centuries of slavery and generations of discrimination, has disintegrated in the wake of the liberal welfare state is only one example.— Thomas Sowell

#### **NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650**

ISSN 1523-4657

[www.njmilitia.org](http://www.njmilitia.org)

[info@njmilitia.org](mailto:info@njmilitia.org)

[walnor@keepandbeararms.com](mailto:walnor@keepandbeararms.com)

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Wake County, NC, Dave (919) 295-4008

#### **Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00**

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_